

CONSERVATION EFFECTS WORKSHEET

Benchmark Management System			
Name	Address	Resource Setting	Resource Problems Before Treatment
Wildlife Land RMS – MLRA 136 (Cropland Wildlife Habitat)		50 acres piedmont farm with row crop production and unmanaged forestland.	Low upland wildlife habitat values.
Benchmark (Present Management System): No upland wildlife habitat management. Cropland primary landuse; wildlife habitat values incidental.			
Actions – Present Management		Effects of Continuing the Benchmark System	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Continue to row crop as per current farming practices. ▪ No wildlife management ▪ Continued applications with ground equipment of pesticides. ▪ Fall mowing of ditches, odd areas, etc. ▪ Fall discing and breaking of crop fields. 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Poor wildlife food production ▪ Poor wildlife nesting cover ▪ Little wildlife travel land cover ▪ Little wildlife edge habitat ▪ Continued high fall population stress ▪ Low fall wildlife populations ▪ High predator losses to small game populations 	

Treatment Options			
Name	Address	Treatment Option Number	Description of Treatment Option
Wildlife Land RMS – MLRA 136 (Cropland Wildlife Habitat)		1	Upland Wildlife Habitat Management
Actions – Proposed Management		Effects of conservation treatment	
328 – Conservation Crop Rotation 338 – Prescribed Burning 645 – Upland Wildlife Habitat Management 666 – Forest Stand Improvement		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Small game nesting cover ▪ Non-game nesting cover ▪ Small game travel cover ▪ Small game edge cover ▪ Small game edge habitat ▪ Edge control ▪ Small game food production 	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Increased nesting cover ▪ Increased non-game nesting cover ▪ Increased small game travel cover ▪ Increased small game food ▪ Decreased soil loss ▪ Increased income potential from upland wildlife ▪ Increased carrying capacity for game and non-game open land wildlife species. 	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Summary impacts: - Quail: 1 bird/ac fall population - Rabbit: 1 rabbit/ac fall population ▪ Hunter days: 120 hunter days 	

CONSERVATION EFFECTS WORKSHEET

Benchmark Management System			
Name	Address	Resource Setting	Resource Problems Before Treatment
Wildlife Land RMS – MLRA 136 Woodland Wildlife Habitat	Alamance County	100 acres (70 acres woodland) Piedmont farm with no woodland wildlife habitat management.	Low woodland wildlife habitat values.
Benchmark (Present Management System): No woodland wildlife habitat management. Wildlife habitat values incidental.			
Actions – Present Management			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Continue to leave woodlands in unmanaged conditions. ▪ No woodland wildlife habitat management ▪ No tree management for mast production ▪ No tree management for den protection 			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Highly variable food production ▪ Fair big game habitat ▪ Low small game population ▪ No edge habitat 			

Treatment Options			
Name	Address	Treatment Option Number	Description of Treatment Option
Wildlife Land RMS – MLRA 136 Woodland Wildlife Habitat	Alamance County	1	Woodland Wildlife Habitat Management
Actions – Proposed Management			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Increased hard mast production ▪ Increased soft mast production ▪ Increased edge habitat ▪ Increased small game nesting cover 			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Increased carrying capacity for big game species ▪ Increase carrying capacity for small game species ▪ Increased hunting opportunity ▪ Increased income potential 			
Impacts			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Quail: 1 bird per 3 acres - Rabbit: 1 rabbit per 3 acres 			

CONSERVATION EFFECTS WORKSHEET

Benchmark Management System			
Name	Address	Resource Setting	Resource Problems Before Treatment
Wildlife RMs – Flat Coastal wooded wetlands along stream systems	Edgecombe County	20 acres site. Flat coastal wooded wetlands along stream systems	Limited wetland wildlife values
Benchmark (Present Management System): No wetland wildlife habitat management.			Effects of Continuing the Benchmark System
Actions – Present Management		Effects of Continuing the Benchmark System	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Leave in present condition ▪ No water management ▪ No tree management ▪ No wetland wildlife habitat management 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Poor food production for wetland wetland species ▪ Negligible soil erosion ▪ No waterfowl production ▪ No waterfowl hunting ▪ Low furbearer production ▪ No air quality problems ▪ No “birding” opportunity 	
Treatment Options			
Name	Address	Treatment Option Number	Description of Treatment Option
Wildlife RMs – Flat Coastal wooded wetlands along stream systems	Edgecombe County	1	Woodland Waterfowl Habitat Management
Actions – Proposed Management			Impacts
<p>356 – Dike</p> <p>587 – Structure for Water Control</p> <p>644 – Wetland Wildlife Habitat Management</p> <p>666 – Forest Stand Improvement</p>			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Increase carrying capacity for wintering waterfowl. ▪ Increase carrying capacity for resident wetland wildlife species. ▪ Provide feeding and loafing habitat for wetland species. ▪ Increased potential for hunting and trapping ▪ Increased income potential from wildlife wetland resource ▪ Increased opportunity for “birding” ▪ Summary Impacts: - Production <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Wood Ducks – 1 brood Muskrats – 1 litter Raccoon – 1 litter
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Increased Wildlife Utilization & Production Hunter 3 @ 6 days each “Birders” 4 @ 10 days each Trappers 1 @ 15 days each

CONSERVATION EFFECTS WORKSHEET

Benchmark Management System			
Name	Address	Resource Setting	Resource Problems Before Treatment
Wildlife Land RMS – MLRA 133A, 153A, Openland Wetland Wildlife Habitat	Pitt County	100 acres – Coastal Plain farm with row crop production	No wetland habitat values
Benchmark (Present Management System): No wetland wildlife management			
Actions – Present Management			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Continue to row crop as per current farming practices ▪ No wetland habitat management 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ No wetland wildlife ▪ No waterfowl hunting ▪ Low furbearer habitat values 	Effects of Continuing the Benchmark System

Treatment Options			
Name	Address	Treatment Option Number	Description of Treatment Option
Wildlife Land RMS – MLRA 133A, 153A, Openland Wetland Wildlife Habitat	Pitt County	1	Wetland Wildlife Habitat Management
Actions – Proposed Management			
644 – Wetland Wildlife Habitat Management 356 – Dike 641 – Water Table Control 642 – Well 533 – Pumping Plant for Water Control		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Waterfowl food production ▪ Water availability ▪ Water Management ▪ Waterfowl habitat 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Increased waterfowl habitat ▪ Increased hunting opportunity ▪ Increased furbearer habitat ▪ Increased wading bird habitat ▪ Utilization: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 4 hunter days per week of hunting season